

REMARKS

In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner divided the claims into the following groups: Claims 1-58 drawn to a method for planarizing a microelectronic workpiece (Group I); and Claims 59-61 drawn to a planarizing machine for planarization of a microelectronic workpiece (Group II). In addition, the Examiner requested an election of one of the following species within Group I (claims 1-58): Species I (Figures 2 and 3A-3D); Species II (Figure 4); and Species III (Figure 5).

In response, the applicant elects Group I (claims 1-58) and Species I (Figures 2 and 3A-3D) without traverse. Based on our review of the application, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11, 12, 14-17, 28, 29, 31-34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, 45 and 48 read on at least Species I and are hereby elected for examination. Claims 3, 8-10, 13, 18-27, 30, 35, 36, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47 and 49-58 are withdrawn and claims 59-61 have been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1, 11, 28, 37 and 48 are generic and traverses the conclusion that only claim 1 is generic. Upon allowance of the generic claims, consideration of withdrawn claims is requested.

A petition to extend the deadline for responding to this restriction requirement by one month and a check in the amount of \$110.00 are filed with this paper. No additional fees are believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge any deficiency in fees herein to Deposit Account No. 50-0065.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



Paul T. Parker

Registration No. 38,264

Date: December 9, 2003

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000